

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JOHN DOE, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BRENT OESTERBLAD,

Defendant.

3:18-cv-00018-LRH-WGC

**MINUTES OF THE COURT**

January 23, 2018

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is Defendant's Motion to Seal Records and Request for Sanctions (ECF No. 16).

Defendant's Motion to Seal Records and Request for Sanctions (ECF No. 16) is **DENIED** without prejudice. As to the sealing of records component of Defendant's motion, the court notes Defendant cites "SRCR Rules 1-8" in support of this motion, which the court assumes are rules regarding the sealing of documents in the District of Arizona. (ECF No. 16 at 2.) Motions to seal shall comply with District of Nevada Local Rule LR 1A 10-5 and the dictates of *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006). *See also*, *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016).

Should Defendant choose to refile the motion to seal, Defendant shall only file the motion and not the accompanying exhibits. The exhibits Defendant has submitted to the court (ECF No. 16-1, pp. 1-156) shall temporarily remain under seal. Defendant will not have to re-serve the documents he has requested be sealed unless the subject documents are not those contained in ECF No. 16-1.

Defendant's Request for Sanctions (ECF No. 16) is **DENIED** without prejudice. Pursuant to LR IC 2-2(b), for *each* type of relief requested or purpose of the document, a *separate* document must be filed. Although Defendant is not an electronic filer, the court imposes the "separate document/type" upon all filings submitted to the court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DEBRA K. KEMPI, CLERK

By: /s/

Deputy Clerk